UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,352	01/30/2004	Barry J. Maurer	9022-41	4884

20792 7590 09/05/2008

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC
PO BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER	
FUBARA, BLESSING M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1618	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/05/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/767,352	MAURER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BLESSING M. FUBARA	1618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *7/27/07*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1,10-12 and 14* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2-9,13 and 15-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The examiner acknowledges receipt of response to election requirement, amendment and remarks filed 7/27/2007. Claims 2-9, 13 and 15 are amended. Claims 1-22 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of treating hyperproliferative disorder and geriatric subject in the reply filed on 7/27/07 is acknowledged. Claims 2-9, 13 and 15-22 are indicated as reading on the elected species. Claims 1, 10-12 and 14 are withdrawn from consideration.

Priority

The examiner acknowledges applicant's claim to benefit of provisional application 60/444,530 filed 1/31/2003.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 15-22, 2-9 and 13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14-21 and 25 and 1-12 of copending Application Nos. 11/170,561. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending claims are directed to the same method of treatment using retinide. Retinide encompasses the specific retinide recited in claim 2.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 15-22, 2-9 and 13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14-21 and 1-12 of copending Application No. 11/170,371. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending claims are directed to the same method of treatment using retinide. Retinide encompasses the specific retinide recited in claim 2.

5. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 15-22, 2-9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maurer et al. (US 6,352,844) in view of Yesair (US, 4874,795, Yesair I) or Yesair (US 5,972,911) and further in view of Gibbs et al. (US 4,665,098) and Weith (US 4,327,116).

9. Maurer teaches method of treating hyperproliferative disorder to a subject in need thereof (abstract; column 1, lines 35-46); the method comprises administering composition comprising fenretinide (column 7, line 35 to column 8, line 67); for oral administration, powders are suspended or made into solution in the presence of carriers (column 14, lines 12-67) such as sucrose, tragacanth and glycerin (column 15, lines 1-4). Treating hyperproliferative disorder meets the method of claim 15 and some examples of the disorder named are "tumors, **cancers,** and neoplastic tissue that can be treated by the present invention include but are not limited to malignant disorders such as breast **cancers**; osteosarcomas; angiosarcomas; fibrosarcomas and other sarcomas; leukemias; lymphomas; sinus tumors; ovarian, uretal, bladder, prostate and other genitourinary **cancers**; colon esophageal and stomach **cancers** and other gastrointestinal **cancers**; lung **cancers**; myelomas; pancreatic **cancers**; liver **cancers**; kidney **cancers**; endocrine **cancers**; skin **cancers**; and brain or central

and peripheral nervous (CNS) system tumors, malignant or benign, including gliomas and neuroblastomas;" and "examples of premalignant and non-neoplastic or non-malignant **hyperproliferative disorders** include but are not limited to myelodysplastic disorders; cervical carcinoma-in-situ; familial intestinal polyposes such as Gardner syndrome; oral leukoplakias; histiocytoses; keloids; hemangiomas; hyperproliferative arterial stenosis, inflammatory arthritis; hyperkeratoses and papulosquamous eruptions including arthritis. Also included are viral induced hyperproliferative diseases such as warts and EBV induced disease (i.e., infectious mononucleosis), scar formation, and the like" (column 5, lines 42-66). Maurer states that the methods of treatment may be employed with any subject known or suspected of carrying or at risk of developing a **hyperproliferative disorder** (column 5, lines 66 and 67). Fenretinide meets claims 15, 2.

10. Maurer does not teach the carriers recited in the claims. However, Yesair I and II disclose oral delivery of fenretinide in a composition that comprises the fenretinide, lysophosphatidyl choline, fatty acid and monoglycerides (abstract; column 4, lines 35-65; column 5, lines 60-67; Example III). Also, Gibbs teaches fenretinide composition that comprises fenretinide or reitinide, corn oil, non-ionic surfactant and that the composition can be delivered by mixing in food, spread on bread or crackers or by filing the composition in a soft or hard gelatin capsule, and can also be delivered in powdered form (column 3, lines 3-7, column 1, lines 60-65. Thus the teaching of delivery by way of food meets claims 16 and 17 and further renders obvious claim 11. The fat and monoglycerides and lysophosphatidyl choline meet the requirements of claims 15, 3. Regarding claims 19 and 20, the geriatric and pedriatric subjects read on Maurer's suggestion that the methods of treatment may be employed

with any subject known or suspected of carrying or at risk of developing a **hyperproliferative disorder** (column 5, lines 66 and 67). The mode of feeding recited in claims 21 and 22 are known methods of feeding a subject needing this mode of feeding. Weith teaches that flour is a thickening agent.

Therefore, taking the teaching of the prior art, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have reasonable expectation of success that modifying the composition of Maurer by using the carrier of Yesair I or II, and delivering the formulation as food item as suggested by Gibbs, the food item having been thickened by flour, would be easily administered to any patient including geriatric or pediatric patient.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BLESSING M. FUBARA whose telephone number is (571)272-0594. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. (Monday to Thursday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Hartley can be reached on (571) 272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Blessing M. Fubara/
Examiner, Art Unit 1618